IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application No.: 09/963,435 Examiner: Chankong, Dohm Filed: September 27, 2001

Group/Art Unit: 2152 Inventor:

Atty. Dkt. No: 5681-78901 Daniel Blaukopf, et al.

Method and Protocol for **Mediating Communication**

between Software and

Applications

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Title:

This supplemental reply brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated January 30, 2007. Appellant respectfully requests that this Supplemental Reply Brief be entered pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 and considered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Appellants filed an Appeal Brief on March 13, 2006. On June 5, 2006, the Examiner issued an Examiner's Answer. In response, Appellants filed a Reply Brief on July 3, 2006. On October 16, 2006, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued an Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner due to matters of conferee signatures and consideration of Information Disclosure Statements (IDS). On January 30, 2007, the Examiner issued a revised Examiner's Answer to address the issues from the Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner. The revised Examiner's Answer is largely a duplicate of the previous Examiner's Answer of June 5, 2006. Other than addressing the above-mentioned issues, the January 30, 2007 Examiner's Answer does not include any additional arguments or grounds of rejection. As such, Appellants' July 3, 2006 Reply Brief addresses and fully rebuts the Examiner's rejections and arguments stated in the revised Examiner's Answer. Appellants' July 3, 2006 Reply Brief is herein incorporated by reference in its entirety. As shown in detail in Appellants' Appeal Brief and Reply Briefs, the Examiner has clearly failed to establish a *prima facie* rejection of claims 1-20.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons submitted in the Appeal Brief, the July 3, 2006 Reply

Brief and this Supplemental Reply Brief, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections of

claims 1-20 are erroneous. Reversal of the Examiner's decision is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be due to Meyertons,

Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-78901/RCK.

3

This Supplemental Reply Brief is submitted with a return receipt postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.

P.O. Box 398

Austin, TX 78767-0398

Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: March 30, 2007